

REMARKS

The present invention relates to a process for manufacturing an electret article, and to an apparatus therefor.

In the Office Action dated June 1, 2012, it was indicated in the Office Action Summary that claims 1 and 3 - 10 were pending and were rejected. The claims were rejected under 35 USC 112, first and second paragraphs, and under 35 USC 103, as was discussed in detailed in the Response filed November 23, 2012.

Furthermore, claims 11 - 14, which were added as new claims in the Amendment filed April 27, 2012, were not examined in the Office Action dated June 1, 2012. In view thereof, it had been requested that the Office Action of June 1, 2012, should be withdrawn, and a new replacement Office Action should be issued including to specifically address claims 11 - 14.

Since the requested action has not been taken, in connection with the filing herewith of a Request for Continued Examination, Applicant files this Amendment Under 37 CFR 1.114(c), including adding new claims 15 and 16, directed to further preferred embodiments of the present invention. Support for the new claims is found, e.g., in the disclosure at pages 10 - 11, original claim 3, etc.

Regarding the rejections under 35 USC 112 and 35 USC 103(a), the former was addressed in detail at pages 4 - 5 of the Response filed November 23, 2012, and the latter was addressed in detail at pages 6 - 13 of the Response filed November 23, 2012.

Furthermore, the undersigned attorney repeats the earlier request to conduct an Interview to discuss the claims, including the new claims 11 - 14 that were added in the Amendment under 37 CFR 1.111 filed April 27 2012, as well as new preferred embodiment claims 15 and 16 added hereinabove.

Claims 11 - 16 are respectfully submitted to be patentable, in addition to the reasons noted above with respect to claims 1 and 3 - 10, in view of the further recitations set forth therein, which provide additional bases for concluding patentability of those claims.

In this regard, it has been previously noted that as the average diameter of the droplets is less than 20 μm , the smaller droplets have a higher surface tension, and thus do not wet the thermoplastic resin fibers when in contact therewith.

This is true, *a fortiori*, in the case of the average diameter of the droplets being 15 μm or less (embodiments of claims 11, 13 and 15), and even more so in the case of the average diameter of the droplets being 12 μm or less (embodiments of claims 12, 14, and 16).

Again, Applicant has provided detailed explanation in the Response filed November 23, 2012, as to compliance of the present claims with respect to the requirements 35 USC 112, as well as the patentability thereof *vis-à-vis* the cited art. Considering that, and in view of Applicant's previous request to conduct an Interview with the Examiner (and as suggested by the Examiner with the Examiner's Supervisor), a Petition for Suspension of Action has been included in this filing together with the Request for Continued Examiner, order to provide time in which to conduct the requested Interview.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby earnestly solicited.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph J. Ruch, Jr.
Registration No. 26,577

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: 202.293.7060
Facsimile: 202.293.7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 3, 2012